

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 134

JC 900 123

AUTHOR Zaritsky, Joyce Ship
TITLE Peer Tutoring: Issues and Concerns. Results of a Survey.
INSTITUTION La Guardia Community Coll., Long Island City, N.Y.
PUB DATE 26 Sep 89
NOTE 27p.; Sabbatical project report, LaGuardia Community College.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; High Risk Students; *Peer Teaching; Postsecondary Education; Remedial Instruction; State Surveys; Supplementary Education; Teacher Student Relationship; *Tutorial Programs; *Tutors; Two Year Colleges; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

In 1988, a survey was conducted to determine the characteristics and extent of peer tutoring programs at two- and four-year colleges in New York. Data were also collected on supplemental instruction, a variant of peer tutoring in which the peer tutor works closely with a faculty member to help students in identified high-risk courses. Of the 270 surveys mailed, 32% were returned. The 59 responding institutions included 28 two-year colleges, 30 four-year colleges, and a technical institute. Survey findings included the following: (1) 95% of the institutions had at least one peer tutoring program; (2) 80% offered peer tutoring for remedial/developmental, entry-level, and advanced courses; (3) 32% selected tutors through faculty recommendations; (4) 96% paid their tutors, and 4% used other means to reward tutors; (5) 41% had centralized tutoring labs to supervise their tutoring programs; (6) institutions most commonly provided supplemental instruction in math, biology, business, chemistry, and English; (7) 96% provided peer tutors with training, with 29% using administrative personnel to train tutors; (8) 74% provided either one-to-one or small group tutoring; (9) 38% required "at risk" students to receive tutoring; and (10) 85% of the institutions indicated that tutoring was available to all who requested it. A 16-item bibliography and the survey questionnaire are appended. (WJT)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED315134

PEER TUTORING: ISSUES AND CONCERNS

RESULTS OF A SURVEY*

Joyce Ship Zaritsky, Ed.d
Associate Professor
Dept. of Communication Skills
LaGuardia Community College

*Written report submitted 9/26/89 outlining project completed
during sabbatical leave 9/88-9/89.

XC 900123

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Weintraub

2

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

PEER TUTORING: ISSUES AND CONCERNS

RESULTS OF A SURVEY*

Joyce Ship Zaritsky, Ed.d
Associate Professor
Dept. of Communication Skills
LaGuardia Community College

*Written report submitted 9/26/89 outlining project completed during sabbatical leave 9/88-9/89.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	1
Introduction.....	1
A. Background.....	1
B. Tutoring as a Support Service.....	2
C. Peer Tutoring.....	4
D. Supplemental Instruction.....	5
Method.....	7
Results.....	7
Discussion and Results.....	16
Recommendations.....	17
Endnotes and Bibilography.....	19
Sample Survey on Peer Tutoring.....	21

ARTICLE ABSTRACT

PEER TUTORING: ISSUES AND CONCERNS RESULTS OF A SURVEY *

The results of a survey mailed out to two and four year colleges throughout New York State indicate that peer tutoring, perhaps because of the individualized instruction it can provide at relatively low cost is almost universally available as a service to students. A variant, "supplemental instruction" in which tutors are attached to "high risk" courses is becoming more and more prevalent. Of the 270 surveys mailed, 32% were returned. 95% of the institutions indicated that they provide peer tutoring, 32% indicated that they also provide supplemental instruction in a wide range of disciplines. Peer tutors are almost always paid (96%) and tutoring is generally without cost to tutees. (86%) As a result of this study, the author recommends that LaGuardia continue its extensive peer tutoring programs but also explore and study the possibility of implementing a supplemental instruction program.

Joyce Ship Zaritsky, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
LaGuardia Community College
Dept. of Communication Skills

*Written report submitted outlining project completed during sabbatical leave 9/88-9/89.

INTRODUCTION

A. Background: Tutoring as a Primary Method of Instruction:

Tutoring , an extremely personalized method of teaching in which instruction occurs either in a one-to-one setting or in small groups, can be traced all the way back to the Greeks. The Socratic method with its method of questioning students individually or in small groups ,eliciting their thought and requiring them to direct their own learning can be viewed as a precursor to the type of individual and small group tutoring that is now taken for granted at so many institutions of higher education as a supplement and support for students experiencing difficulty with their studies. For the Greeks however, tutoring served as their primary means of instruction and thus teachers or scholars were used. In England as well, at Oxford University, the tutorial, a once a week private meeting of student and teacher has served as an important and primary component of a student's education for many years. (Moore, 1968) In a more popular vein, the British film Educating Rita (Gilbert, 1983) depicted this tutorial system of education in a British university. In the film, Rita, a lower class woman is tutored over a lengthy period of time by a British professor . As a result of this tutorial experience , one sees a dramatic growth in her, both intellectually and emotionally. In this country, as well, tutorial systems of instruction in which faculty actually tutor have been employed. They are sometimes referred to as honors courses, independent study or tutorialns. Harvard University has employed a tutorial system using faculty since 1912 as a supplement to its course work. (Bonthius 1957) (Garstka, 1979)

More recently, Harvard Medical School implemented a tutorial system of instruction for its first and second year students, largely replacing the lecture system it had employed for decades. (Nova 1989)

B. Tutoring as a Support Service to Instruction:

Another type of tutoring, more commonly employed in this country does not regularly use faculty and instead employs students as tutors, usually peers, or professional tutors, who may be graduate students or retired teachers. Unlike the British system, this tutoring is not intended to be the primary means of instruction for students, instead it is intended to be supportive or supplementary and is usually aimed at students who are experiencing difficulty with their courses.

According to the Random House College Dictionary, the noun "tutor" stems from Middle English derived from Latin "tut(us)" meaning "protector" and is the past participle of "tueri" which translates "to guard." It is interesting that this derivation is coincidentally closer to the way in which tutoring is currently used in higher education when it is used to supplement instruction for "at risk" students and therefore is intended to protect or "guard" students against failure .

In the United States, the lecture method of teaching - either in large lecture halls or in smaller classrooms has tended to dominate institutions of higher learning probably because of its so-called "cost effectiveness". When faced with a course that covers a great deal of information that many students have to take, institutions often decide to teach it using one faculty member instructing anywhere from 35 - 400 students. To somewhat

ameliorate the impersonality of this very large group instruction, graduate students are hired to teach smaller weekly sections. However, even these instructional sections can be large and impersonal and frequently only mirror the instruction of the larger lectures. Many students, especially students who have been admitted under "open admission" policies have difficulty learning and succeeding in these large scale impersonal instructional formats. Using faculty to tutor, in the British model, is prohibitive for most American institutions both financially and logistically given the large number of students requiring this extra help. Pushed by concerns about attrition which were undoubtedly exacerbated by the advent of the more recent policy of "open admissions" at many institutions, particularly community colleges, has led to the extensive use of tutoring not as a primary form of instruction but as a means of supporting "at risk" students and thereby reducing attrition. In fact, the successful developmental programs described by Roueche and Snow (Roueche and Snow, 1977), cite tutoring as a major component of these programs. As far back as 1975-76, they found in a national study of developmental/remedial programs that 86% of the community colleges surveyed had some special services for special students that included tutoring.

Likewise, the results of this survey revealing an extensive use of tutoring in colleges throughout New York State attesting to a general belief that tutoring can serve to "protect" or "guard" students from failure. This survey revealed that these tutoring programs have been expanded so that they are not just available for "special" at-risk students such as those in HEOP or

other federally funded programs but are available more or less to all students requesting help.

C. Peer Tutoring:

Peer tutoring - the use of students to help students- was the primary focus of this survey. Its extensive use and acceptance attests to general agreement and awareness of research (Booher, 1982) (Cooke, 1977) (Ross, 1972) indicating that successful students when employed as peer tutors can be a cost effective method and practical method for reducing attrition. Students or peers can frequently be more effective "protectors" than adults, thereby preventing "the 'open door' from becoming a 'revolving door'." (Cooke, 1977) Perhaps because they are closer in age and situation they are better able to understand the problems students are experiencing than older professionals. In addition they can serve as a valuable role model. Grant and Holber (Grant and Holber, 1978) discuss this saying that the peer tutor can be so effective because "he has more experience at being a student than he has at being anything else....the peer tutor can say, "I went through the same thing you are going through". For a basic skills student there is no authority stronger than shared experience." In addition to its cost effectiveness, peer tutoring has particular appeal since there is evidence that not only do the students tutored gain - the tutees- but the students who serve as peer tutors also experience both academic and affective gains - i.e. improvement in self confidence. In a study of the effect of peer tutoring on both reading efficiency and self concept on disadvantaged

community college freshmen, Ross found that the greatest gains in self- concept were made by tutors who had been tutees themselves. (Ross 1972) As an anecdotal addition, a student at Laguardia Community College when asked to evaluate her peer tutoring experience after completing a tutor-training course reported:

"Tutoring is very fascinating and encouraging. It gives me alot of confidence to tutor someone and I learn alot from my tutee."...She (referring to her tutee)taught me more than I taught her. " (Zaritsky, 1988)

As early as 1974, Cross conducted a survey of community colleges and found that a predominant trend towards more individualized instruction, including peer tutoring, as a response to the large numbers of underprepared students.(Cross 1975) In fact, peer tutoring was found to be one of 11 characteritsics exhibited by successful remedial/developmental programs in a later national survey done by Roueche.(Roueche, 1984.)

D. Supplemental Instruction:

A varient of peer tutoring termed "supplemental instruction" was also surveyed. (Hereafter referred to as S.I.) S.I also involves tutoring and usually employs peer tutors, but it is different in that it shifts the emphasis from high-risk students to the identification of high-risk courses- courses in which a high percentage of students have failed, withdrawn or experienced difficulty. Peer tutors , students who have successfully completed these courses, are then assigned to a faculty member whom they assist by providing "supplemental instruction" for the course to at risk students .S.I. may take the form of scheduled

study or review sessions, drop-in individual or small group tutoring or one-to-one scheduled tutoring. It is different from traditional tutoring in that the peer tutor usually works closely with the faculty member very often becoming a resource person for the instructor. Thus the tutor, frequently serves as a liaison between student and teacher and is able to alert the faculty member of instructional problems. A recent controlled research study of S.I. concluded that when S.I. services are utilized by high-risk students their performance and retention are significantly improved. (Blanc, DeBuhr and Martin, 1983.)

This author became interested in S.I. as a result of a visit made to Brooklyn college in the fall of 1988. At Brooklyn, supplemental instruction is offered for five of the ten required core courses. A tutor is assigned to each section of Core Studies 1 (Classics), Core 3 (People, Power and Politics, Core 4 (Shaping of the Modern World, Core 5 (Math Reasoning & Computer Programming and Core 10 (Philosophy) and actually sometimes assumes an assistant teacher role. Tutors must have successfully completed the course and are recommended by faculty. They are paid to audit the course a second time when they are tutoring. Extensive training is provided by administrative personnel, other experienced peer tutors as well as faculty. Brooklyn college has found their S.I. program to be extremely beneficial for many reasons. It has reduced the failure rate in these courses. In addition, because many students attend the S.I. sessions who are not "at-risk" students, it has helped to reduce the stigma of "going for tutoring" and thereby ironically encouraged "at risk" students to participate. It has also raised

the average grade of students who were not judged to be "at risk" In addition there have been gains for the tutors. According to Dean Oestereicher, employment as tutors has provided many students with an opportunity to establish a personal relationship with a faculty member , and has encouraged some to pursue careers in higher education . Some comments made by peer tutors during this visit were: "Makes you a better student", "I had intended to become an accountant, but I enjoy the teaching so much that I now intend to become a college professor and teach history" (Oestereicher, 1988).

The results of the survey described in this paper indicate that more and more institutions are providing S.I. as an alternative or in addition to traditional peer tutoring .

METHOD

270 surveys were mailed out to two and four year institutions of higher learning within New York State. (See Appendix for a copy of the survey) 87 surveys were returned , representing 59 institutions - a return of 32%.

RESULTS

28 or 47%* of the respondents were from two year institutions, while 30 or 51% were from four year institutions. One or 2% designated itself as a "technical" institution.

36 or 63% stated they were public institutions, while 21 or 37% reported that they were private institutions.

Enrollment figures were tremendously diverse and reported as varying from a low of 500 or a high of 13,000. Using Rug's

*Numbers and percentages will vary slightly since not all respondents answered all questions.

classification of colleges (Rug, 1988-89) the institutions reporting were classified as follows:

- a. 10 or 19% can be classified as small (FTE under 1000)
- b. 19 or 37% " " " moderate (FTE 1000-3000)
- c. 16 or 31% " " " medium (FTE 3000-8000)
- d. 7 or 14% " " " large (FTE 8000-20,000)
- e. 0 " " " extra large (FTE over 20,000)

56 or 95 % of the institutions reported that they have at least one peer tutoring program . Only 3 or 5 % reported they did not (item #5) revealing a wide acceptance and use of peer tutoring as a support system at institutions throughout the state. Institutions reported that the number of tutoring programs they support ranged from 1-14 (item #6). This diversity can be explained since responses indicated that institutions have organized their programs differently - for example 24 or 45% reported only one peer tutoring program stating that their program provided tutoring for many different disciplines under one central administration, while those reporting several peer tutoring programs employed a more decentralized approach to accomodate the various disciplines studied.

Funding (item #7) was usually reported as stemming from a variety of sources- most reported a combination of sources, e.g. the college, grant funding, federal and state funds for EOP and other "special" category students. The "others" reported were student government funds -two institutions , faculty-student association - one institution, volunteers were reported as a source in three institutions.

45 or 80% (item #8) reported that peer tutoring is available at all three levels , remedial/developmental courses, entry level courses as well as advanced courses. Only one or 2% reported

that peer tutoring was available only on the remedial/developmental level, 3 or 5% reported tutoring available at both remedial/developmentaland entry levels , 2 or 4% reported peer tutoring available at both entry and advanced - therefore no developmental level tutoring , while 3 or 5% reported that peer tutoring is available at remedial, entry and some advanced.

16 or 32% (item #9) reported that they provide peer tutoring in all of the usual remedial/developmental areas, namely reading, writing, mathematics and ESL. 19 or 38% reported it available in all except ESL . The others reported different groupings. If one groups those reporting tutoring in all areas (32%) with those reporting it in all areas except ESL (38%) (since many upstate colleges do not have ESL programs) 70% of the institutions with peer tutoring are providing it in all remedial/developmental areas.

Peer tutoring in the content areas (item #10) was also reported as available across the board in almost all the disciplines. 46 or 84% reported peer tutoring available in all the areas queried. In addition of these 46 institutions 18% reported that they provide tutoring in additional disciplines not cited, such as agriculture, computer science, music, early childhood, foreign language. One respondent remarked that tutoring is available in all areas in her institution "unless a tutor is impossible to find".

Responses (item #11) revealed that tutors are selected by a variety of methods. The largest number of institutions (18 or 32%) reported selecting tutors through faculty recommendation.

The next largest group (19 or 34%) reported that they used a variety of methods to recruit tutors, , with several indicating that they also used the Dean's list. One institution indicated that recruiters go into Education courses to actively recruit. The remainder of the responses consisted of a smattering of other responses and combinations of responses. The presence of peer tutoring courses was surprising. 24 or 43% indicating that they use some type of course to select peer tutors.

Overwhelmingly, the survey results reveal that institutions recognize that it is necessary to pay their peer tutors. (item 12) 53 or 96% indicated that they do pay their peer tutors. Of these 53, two (4%) indicated that they also use volunteers who are given a certificate of recognition. One of these institutions mentioned that peer tutors are paid minimum wage as part of their work study. Only one institution (2%) indicated that they use volunteers exclusively, while another institution answered "Yes and No - depending on program" indicating that in some areas they do and in others they don't.

In addition to payment, (item #13) seven institutions (13% of the 55 who answered item #12 above) indicated that they also use other means to reward their tutors. Course credit was mentioned by three institutions, single institutions mentioned the following as well: tuition remission (clearly a form of payment), a letter placed in the student's permanent file, a letter of recommendation, as a requirement for membership in the Honor Society for Math tutors.

The largest number of institutions, 22 or 41% reported that their tutoring programs are supervised by a centralized tutoring

lab (item #14). The next largest responding institutions 14 or 26%, indicated that there was some type of centralized administration that supervised their peer tutoring program. Three institutions (6%) responded that they have a centralized tutoring lab as well as a centralized administration. The remainder of the responses were scattered with only 5 (9%) indicating that each department supervised its own tutoring.

25 or 45% that tutoring is provided through a centralized tutoring lab or program (item #15). 10 or 18% indicated they used a centralized tutoring lab in addition to attaching tutoring to specific courses. Combining these two figures, it is evident that 63% indicated that they have centralized their peer tutoring operation. Perhaps typically, one respondent mentioned "tutoring is coordinated through the Learning Center by a student employee and a full time faculty member." Only 2 (4%) indicated that tutoring is provided by each department, and 4 (7%) that it is provided through individual subject labs. Supplemental instruction - the assigning of tutoring to specific courses was mentioned by 18 institutions (32%).

33 institutions (59%) reported that they attach tutoring to specific courses indicating that they provide some type of supplemental instruction (item #16). The number of courses per institution varied from a low of one to a high of 18. Institutions appear to provide supplemental instruction most commonly in the following disciplines Math: 15 or 45% Biology (including Botany, Zoology, Anatomy and Physiology): 15 or 45%, Business: 10 or 30%, Chemistry: 8 or 24%, English: 6 or 18%,

Psychology: 6 or 18%, Economics: 6 or 18%, Computer Science: 4 or 12%, Philosophy: 4 or 12%, History: 4 or 12%. Three institutions or 9% stated that they provided it for all disciplines "if the faculty member requests it" adding "currently 13 disciplines are represented." Other disciplines mentioned by three or fewer institutions: Sociology, Physics, "Learning to Learn" (study skills?) Core Studies representing 5 disciplines, all introductory courses, Technology, Nursing, Word Processing , Nursing, Technology, Science, Developmental Writing, Developmental Reading.

The reasons given for providing peer tutoring or supplemental instruction for specific courses differed (item #17). Five (16%) indicated that a high failure rate was the reason for tutoring. Another five (16%) indicated that the course was perceived as the most difficult. Eight (25%) responded that a high failure rate and the perception that the course was perceived as the most difficult. Four respondents (13%) mentioned that tutoring was provided at their institutions because of the large number of students taking the course. As an example, one respondent wrote: "introductory survey courses have courses have high freshmen enrollment and lecture format". The remainder of the responses were extremely individual with only one or two institutions listing them. They ranged from "tutoring provided for students on probation", "tutoring provided for required entry level courses that bridge gap between high school and college", "to increase student success", "all writing can be improved", "specialized courses" , "large number of returning adult students with weak math skills".

The largest number of respondents, 39 or 74%, that tutoring is provided in a combination of two formats - one-to-one as well as small group (item #18). Eight or 15% indicated that tutoring is only provided in a one-to-one format, while one institution or 2% indicated that it provides tutoring only in a small group setting. Tutoring using all the formats, one-to-one, small group and large group, was indicated by six respondents - 11%. One of these institutions - with an extensive supplemental instruction program - commented "pre-exam reviews may attract up to 100 students". Only one institution- 2%- indicated that tutoring is only provided in a large group format. One institution added "computer-assisted instruction" as an additional format.

54 or 96% indicated that they provide their peer tutors with training, while only 2 or 4% indicated that they do not, one of these two indicating that they provide do provide a "very little" (item #19). When asked to approximate the total number of hours of training provided to their peer tutors (item #20), 19 or 43% indicated that 3-5 hours are provided, 11 or 25% indicated that one-to two hours are provided, while 8 or 18% stated that 6-10 hours are provided. Two respondents (5%) indicated that they provided a one semester course for their writing tutors. Other responses: "a single evening is provided in addition to an initial interview", "one-two hours initially then periodically as needed", " training varies for each program, from one-20 hours" "varies from 1-10 hours according to program."

A wide variety of different personnel are used to provide training (item #21). The largest number of institutions , 15 or 29% reported that training is provided by administrative

personnel , another 11 or 21% reported that it is provided by lab supervisors. Combining these two figures it is evident that fully 50 % use some type of supervisory personnel for training. Many other combinations were reported, for example 4 or 8% responded that training is provided by faculty and administrative personnel, another 4 or 8% said faculty and lab supervisors , three or 6% responded that all four possibilities were used , 8 or 15% cited a peer tutoring course alone or in combination with other responses. 18 or 35% included faculty as part of their response, alone or in combination with other choices.

It was impossible to code responses to items #22 and #23 in any meaningful way. Numbers of tutors hired each semester varied from 10-100. Numbers of students receiving tutoring each semester varied from 50-2400. Many respondents that they did not know, others indicated that they only kept track of sessions provided, not number of students serviced. Some responded that figures varied greatly from semester to semester.

Most respondents (33 or 65%) indicated that a variety of means are used to select tutees(item #24) including self-selection, faculty, counsellors .Three mentioned that they used tests solely or in combination. Only 5 or 9% said that tutees were entirely self-selected, although self -selection was mentioned alone or in combination by fully 46 or 88%!

21 or 38% reported that "at risk" students are required to receive tutoring (item #25). Two of these qualified their response saying "it depends on the instructor", and "first year students only". Nine respondents or 16% reported "some", with comments like "depends on program", "depends on professor", "only

in reading and writing area", "the 'at risk' top students are required," four of these nine or 44% said tutoring was required only for "special" service students, such as EOP, SSSP or HEOP programs. 25 or 45% responded "No"- "at risk" students were not required to receive tutoring. two or 8% of these 25 mentioned that although not required, students were "encouraged" to get tutoring.

The vast majority, 47 or 85%, responded that tutoring is available to all who request it (item #26). Seven or 13% responded "No", of these 3 or 42% said it was only available for high-risk students, 1 or 2% wrote "Yes-No" - adding "at some labs "Yes", at other labs "No", "Yes for HEOP students."

The vast majority of institutions provide free peer tutoring for students with 48 or 86% responding that students did not pay for tutoring (item #28). In addition, four or 7% responded "Yes-No" with the following comments : "Free for EOP, others pay \$8.00", "Yes for private tutoring, no (payment) for group,", "it varies", "No for HEOP, supplemental instruction and division labs and yes for individual students". Only 3 or 5% responded with an unqualified "Yes" to this item, one of these said the payment was a \$10/semester registration fee - hardly a major expense!

Fees for tutoring ranged from \$4 - \$8 an hour amongst the five responses (item #29). As stated previously one institution reported a \$10/semester registration as a fee.

Responses to this open-ended item (#30) were extremely varied and generous. Some respondents attached lengthy explanations of their peer tutoring programs, some attached informative literature designed for tutees or tutors, others

enclosed lab or administrative materials such as schedules, lab evaluation forms, still others included educational materials such as tutor training materials, guidelines for peer tutors, syllabi for peer tutor training courses.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS:

Respondants were extremely generous in providing information. Based on the results of this survey one can reasonably conclude that peer tutoring is widely available without cost to students attending institutions in New York State. It is apparent that most institutions recognize that peer tutoring is a worthwhile, and necessary supportive service. Peer tutoring can provide a student with a more personalized instruction and can help to counteract some of the negatives of large-scale lecture format instruction. In addition, for an institution, it is a relatively inexpensive service to provide, since students, when hired as peer tutors can be paid relatively little. One can only surmise that institutions must be aware of the research that documents gains to tutors as well as to tutees. With respect to the quality of tutoring provided, this survey could only provide a glimpse. It is generally accepted that if peer tutors are to be effective, they must be trained. It is apparent from this survey that although most institutions do provide some training to their peer tutors, the amount of training is relatively little and probably inadequate. It was impossible of course to evaluate the quality of this training. In addition, the survey revealed that for the most part "at risk" students are not required to receive tutoring. Whether this is a philosophical issue, i.e. students are regarded as adults and therefore must be the ones to

recognize they need help and then seek it out, or a cost or logistics factor could not be determined from this survey. However, if institutions wish to reduce their attrition rates the fact that "at risk" students are precisely the ones who generally do not seek out help must be addressed.

Finally, responses to this survey indicate that supplemental instruction programs are becoming more and more prevalent. Focusing on "high-risk" courses rather than on "high-risk" students is seen as a worthwhile additional service. Again, it was not possible by means of this survey to evaluate the quality of these S. I. programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

LaGuardia Community College is an institution that has recognized since its inception that tutoring is an essential support service and has generously provided it. The presence of numerous labs in the developmental areas in which tutors are employed as well as the many tutoring grants that have been written and funded all indicate that tutoring is generally available to LaGuardia students requesting it. However, LaGuardia Community College is known rightfully as an institution that continually looks for ways to improve the education it provides its students. Additional peer tutoring programs can only help to reduce attrition- one of the college's main goals. It is in this context that the following is recommended:

1. Ways to fund peer tutoring programs in the various major subject areas , particularly for introductory courses with high failure rates, should be explored. Successful students are a valuable resource. With modest resources they could be trained and paid to tutor students who remain at risk even after they have successfully completed developmental courses.

2. In addition, the implementation of a supplemental instruction program as described in this report should be explored. S.I. programs offer a viable and efficient method of providing peer tutoring to students experiencing difficulty in introductory subject area courses. They tend to be relatively low in cost to run , can be extremely helpful to both tutor and tutee and can serve as an excellent resource to faculty. Finally they can be extremely valuable to the college as a whole by helping attain its important goal of reducing student attrition.

ENDNOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blanc, Robert A., Larry E. DeBuhr and Deanna C. Martin (1983). "Breaking the Attrition Cycle: The Effects of Supplemental Instruction on Undergraduate Performance and Attrition". Journal of Higher Education, 54, (1), 80-90.

Bonthius, Robert, James Davis & J. Garber Drushal (1957). The Independent Study Program in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press.

Booher, Sandra C. (1982). "A Report on the Tutorial Outreach Model for Reading and Writing across the Curriculum at Los Medanos College". Washington DC: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Also available from ERIC as ED221252.

Cooke, Winne B. (1977). "Resources for Student Learning. Research Report: National Project II: Alternatives to the Revolving Door." Washington DC, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Also available from ERIC as ED 154866.

Cross, Patricia K. (1975). "Years of Change for Community Colleges: 1970-1974", Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, v.2 . Also available from ERIC as ED 110111

Garstka, Polly (1979). "The Role of Tutoring in Community Colleges. Available from ERIC as ED 168613.

Gilbert, Lewis, (Producer and Director). (1983). Educating Rita, (Film) with Michael Caine and Julie Walters. Columbia Pictures.

Grant, Mary Kathryn, & Holber, Daniel (1978). Basic Skills Program: Are They Working? Washington, D.C.: America Association of Higher Education.

Moore, Will G. (1968). The Tutorial System and Its Future, London: Pergamon Press, 1-23.

Nova, (1989). Television program dealing with the implementation of a tutorial system of instruction at Harvard Medical School, aired on WNET, Channel 13, Newark NJ .April 25, 1989.

Oestereicher, Mary. (Dean), (1988). Brooklyn College, Interview with Dean Mary Oestereicher, 11/2/88.

Ross, Sandra F. (1972). " A Study to Determine the Effect of Peer Tutoring on the Reading Efficiency and Self Concept of Disadvantaged Community College Freshmen: Final Report", Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Research and Development. Also available from ERIC as ED 081415.

Roueche, John J. & Snow, Jerry J. (1977). Overcoming Learning Problems. San Francisco, Joseey-Bass Publishers.

Roueche, John E. (1984). "Literacy Needs and Developments in American Community Colleges". Paper presented at the National Adult Literacy Conference. Washington DC, January 19-20, 1984. Available from ERIC: ED 240291.

Rug's Recommendation on the Colleges (1988-89). 5th edition .

Zaritsky, Joyce S. (1988.) "Evaluation of tutoring experience" written by student in author's Reading Improvement course at LaGuardia Community College, Winter quarter .

SURVEY ON PEER TUTORING

Return by Feb. 27 in enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope.

A. Background Information

1. Name of Institution: _____
2. Two year _____ Four year: _____ Technical _____
3. Public _____ Private _____
4. Approximate full time enrollment: _____

B. Questions on Peer Tutoring: (please underline your responses)

5. Do you have a peer tutoring program(s) at your college? a. Yes b. No
6. How many peer tutoring programs do you have? _____
7. How are they funded: a. by the college b. grant c. combination d. self-supporting e. other _____
8. Peer tutoring is available at the following levels:
a. remedial/developmental b. entry level courses c. advanced courses
9. At the remedial/developmental level, peer tutoring is available in the following areas: a. reading b. writing c. mathematics d. ESL (English as a Second Language)
10. Peer tutoring is available in the following content areas:
a. Humanities b. Social Sciences c. Sciences d. Business e. Mathematics f. Other _____
11. How are tutors selected? a. faculty recommendation b. advertisements c. word of mouth d. participation in training course e. other _____
12. Are tutors paid? Yes No
13. If not paid, how else are they "rewarded"? _____

14. How is your tutoring program supervised: a. centralized administration b. each department c. centralized tutoring lab d. other _____
15. How is your tutoring provided? a. by each department b. through a centralized tutoring lab or program c. through individual subject labs d. attached to specific courses (supplemental instruction model) e. other _____

16. If tutor is "attached" to specific courses, list the courses;

17. Tutoring (or supplemental instruction) is provided for these courses because: a. high failure rate b. perceived as most difficult c. other : _____

18. Is tutoring a. one-on-one b. small group (no more than 5) c. combination d. large group e. other _____

19. Are tutors provided with any training? a. Yes b. No

20. Approximate number of hours of training provided: a. 1-2 b. 3-5, c. 6-10 d. other _____

21. Training is provided by: a. faculty b. administrative personnel c. lab supervisors d. peer tutoring course e. other _____

22. Approximately how many tutors are hired each semester? _____

23. Approximately how many students receive tutoring each semester/quarter ? _____

24. How are tutees selected? a. self-selected b. faculty c. administration d. counsellors e. other _____

25. Are "at risk" students required to receive tutoring? a. Yes b. No

26. Is tutoring available to all students who request it?
a. Yes b. No

27. If not all, approximately what percentage of students who request tutoring receive it? _____

28. Must tutees pay for tutoring? Yes No

29. If "Yes" to #28, what is the average fee? _____

30. Other comments or information about your peer tutoring program(s)? Please forward any literature you have about your peer tutoring program(s).

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return it by Feb. 27 in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope Do you wish a copy of my results? _____

Send results to: _____ Position _____
Address: _____

22

Dr. Joyce Zaritsky (718)482-5625
Dept. of Communications Skills
LaGuardia Community College

27

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges MAR 22 1990